DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 933 EA 008 079

AUTHOR Conklyn, Elizabeth D.
TITLE Role Definition by the Principal: Effects and Determinants.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 19-23, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Bibliographies; Leadership; *Management; Models; *Motivation; *Principals; Rewards; *Role Perception; Role Theory; School Superintendents; Senior High Schools; Statistical Analysis

ABSTRACT

This research examined Mintzberg's-dimensional model of the managerial job. Two questions were asked: (1) What effect do the job incumbent's career goals and activity preferences have on perceived importanceof the roles; (2) How does perceived importance of the roles affect job performance? One hundred seventy principals responded to a questionnaire on importance and enjoyment of the roles, desirability of work-related outcomes, and demographic variables. One hundred thirty superintendents rated the importance of these roles for the principal; superintendent ratings of principal performance were obtained for 70 principals. State records provided rate of teacher turnover and size of school. Principals' activity and work outcome preferences were related to job perceptions, as was composition of the student body by program. Although superintendents and principals agreed on importance rankings of the 10 roles, they did not agree on the importance of each role. Neither superintendent-principal differences nor principal importance rating alone was associated with superintendents' performance evaluation. The difference between superintendent and principal was related to rate of teacher turnover. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED120933

22.10
EA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ROLE DEFINITION BY THE PRINCIPAL: EFFECTS AND DETERMINANTS

Elizabeth D. Conklyn
School of Business and Economics
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Greensboro, NC 27412

Paper presented to the American Educational
Research Association
San Francisco, April 1976

EA 008 079

ROLE DEFINITION BY THE PRINCIPAL: EFFECTS AND DETERMINANTS

Despite the voluminous nature of leadership literature, our understanding of the leadership process remains limited (Stogdill, 1974). The evidence that has been accumulated focuses heavily on the leader's interaction with the group; in formal organizations the subordinate group is only one of a number of important constituencies attempting to influence the leader. The manager is very conscious of his/her place in a total system (McCall, 1974) and feels the conflict generated by opposing demands from various role senders (Kahn, et al, 1964). To single out leader-group relationships ignores important elements in the leader's environment which impinge strongly on the role definition. How the leader resolves conflict over role expectations depends on the ability of role senders to control rewards preferred by the leader (Adams, 1974); yet the topic of managerial motivation has received little attention to date (Campbell et al., 1970).

This study addressed two questions arising from the above statements: (1) To what extent do the leader's own reward preferences affect perceptions of the leadership role demands? (2) Can a role set that deals with the leader's entire system improve our ability to differentiate effective from less effective leaders?

Previous Research

In the early part of this century, leadership was largely attributed -- by psychologists anyway -- to personal traits or characteristics of the leader; sparked by Galton's work on hereditary abilities, researchers looked at a host of traits including intelligence, locus of control, field dependence, various verbal abilities, dominance, activity level, height, extroversion, and so on. Some of these, in fact, have a low but consistent relationship with emergence as a leader or with acceptance as a leader by the group. Nonetheless, the

trait approach was highly unsatisfactory for explaining differences in leader effectiveness, particularly among formal leaders or supervisors (Gibb, 1969).

In the mid-forties, the emphasis turned to leadership styles. The seminal works in this area were done at Michigan and at Ohio State (Stogdill and Coons, 1957). In both cases, lengthy lists of leader behaviors were derived, administered to a large group of subjects, then factored or clustered into major styles. The Ohio State researchers arrived at four factors, although two were later dropped as explaining too small a percentage of the variance. The remaining two variables became famous as the Ohio State factors: consideration and task orientation (e.g., Hemphill, 1950; Halpin and Winer, 1957). Since then, three, four, and five factor models have been reported (Bowers and Seashore, 1966); yet, some form of the basic two factors runs through each of these models despite widespread variations in name, and these two factors permeate leadership research, training, and theory (e.g., Halpin, 1954; Blake and Mouton, 1964; Korman, 1966; House, 1962; Fleishman and Harris, 1962).

Coming from the milieu of informal groups and emergent leadership research, students of leadership had narrowed in on: the leader's interaction with the group (e.g., Fleishman, 1957; Christner and Hemphill, 1955; Stogdill et al., 1965); how the leader compared/contrasted with this group on a number of personality and behavioral dimensions (e.g., Gibb, 1967); how leadership style affected group satisfaction and/or productivity (e.g., Evans, 1969; House, 1970; Bass, 1967); or how leader style was affected by group satisfaction and/or productivity (e.g., Lowin and Craig, 1968; Goodstadt and Kipnis, 1970). The result of all this effort is a confusing array of low (at best) correlations between each leadership style and various outcomes.

Somewhat more sophisticated models have attempted to provide a sorely missing theoretical framework by exploring situational moderators or by focusing on subordinate motivation. Of the former, Fiedler's contingency model is the

best known. Fiedler (1967) expanded the basic style model by adding three moderating variables: leader-member relations, amount of structure provided by the task, and the position power vested in the leader. Together these factors constitute an index of situational favorableness for the leader. At either extreme of this index, a task-oriented style would be effective; in the mid-range of the index, a person-oriented style would be more appropriate. Despite the conceptual and methodological issues that plague this model (McMahon, 1972; Graen, Orris and Alvarez, 1971), it represents an attempt to broaden the leadership approach to include environmental variables. Nevertheless, Fiedler's model maintained primary interest in the leader-group relationship.

The second approach is the path-goal model of leadership (Evans, 1970; House, 1971). This model explains the effect of consideration and initiating structure by their consequences for subordinates; leader behavior can provide important rewards in its own right or can clarify the paths to other rewards sought by the subordinate. While this model offers a rationale for the rapidly accumulating style research, the path-goal model is still restricted to the leader-group phenomenon.

With the increasing interest in an open-systems approach to organizations (e.g., Katz and Kahn, 1966; Weick, 1969; Maurer, 1971), leadership theorists began to approach the formal leader as a member of a larger system. In this paradigm, two new factors emerged in research on formal leaders. First, it became imperative to discover system demands on the manager. If there are other duties besides "leading the group," what are they and how do they constrain the leader's behavior? Second, in a large organization, a manager would be embroiled in a wide-ranging interpersonal network; non-group interactions impact on the leader's entire behavior including that vis-a-vis the group. Taken together they imply that leadership is a far more complex, multi-faceted phenomenon than has been appreciated in the social-psychological

leadership tradition. Although few in number, several studies exist on the nature of managerial work.

Time Demands. Carlson studied nine Swedish company presidents; while each participant averaged an hour per day on solitary activities, intervals of calm typically occurred in periods of 10-15 minutes (Carlson, 1951). Guest (1956) found that first-line foremen averaged 48 seconds per activity; Ponder (1957) also studied foremen, finding their mean activity duration to be two minutes. Mintzberg (1973), observing the activities of five top executives, discovered that 50% of their activities took less than nine minutes and only 10% took more than an hour. One of the outstanding features of formal leadership was the brief and varied nature of the activities involved.

Nature of Activities. Verbal interaction consumed the greatest portion of the managers' time; estimates ranged from 57% of the leader's time (Guest, 1956) to 89% (Lawler, Porter and Tannebaum, 1968). Of this interaction time, scheduled meetings took the largest portion of top executives' time (Mintzberg, 1973), although unscheduled meetings accounted for as many activities. Desk work, viewed as a necessary evil by most managers, represented short and relatively infrequent work periods. Explanations noted that written documents tend to be a time-consuming and not current; consequently, mail and memos were of limited usefulness in a fast-paced, active environment (Carlson, 1951; Mintzberg, 1973).

Kinds of Interactions. There were consistent findings on the allocation of time to various groups; all leaders were found to maintain a complex network that reached far beyond the immediate work group. The following chart shows the results of three studies:

TIME (%) SPENT WITH:

	Subordinates	Superiors	Others
Middle and upper levels (Stewart, 1967)	41	12	47
Foremen (Jasinski, 1956)	46	10	44
Chief executives (Mintzberg, 1973)	48	7	44

The others in the above chart are both internal and external people. Categories include clients, suppliers, government and professional officials, consultants, politicians, specialists, and colleagues. All of these made requests or demands on the leader.

The need to interact with non-subordinate others is important within the organization as well. Sayles (1964) contends that a critical part of the managerial function is the establishment of negotiated relationships with other units in the organization. Even when other departments are expected to work with that of the focal manager, different performance standards, ambiguities in the nature of the relationship, and so on act to disrupt smooth transactions. Therefore, the manager must work on structuring relationships with other organizational units to safeguard effective performance of his own unit. Sayles argues that much of this structuring is accomplished through personal negotiations based on exchange of favors. Commitments generated in these negotiations constrain the manager's freedom of action with other groups, e.g., subordinates.

Burns (1954) and Thompson (1966, 1967) suggest that managers spend a considerable amount of time with peer groups. Thompson considers these clique relationships to represent specialized centers of information. In a related area, De Vries (1975) discovered that peers had far more impact on the focal person's role behaviors than did superiors.

There is considerable evidence that these pressures are seen by the leader as incompatible, at best as ambiguous. Subordinate demands conflict among themselves (Wernimont, 1971), and/or superiors may give conflicting demands (Ulrich, et al., 1950). Snock (1962) found considerable role strain in supervisory positions; this stress was positively related to diversity of interactions carried on by the role incumbent. Research by Kahn, et al (1964) strongly indicates that school superintendents who are not exposed to conflicting expectations are extremely rare.

Given these incompatible demands, a leader is faced with a serious dilemma. Assuming that he/she cannot constantly hide failure to meet expectations from any particular role sender, the leader must choose one course of behavior over another. Such a choice may be made on the basis of the manager's personal style (e.g., Fiedler, 1965; Margargee et al, 1966) or as a reaction to various environmental stimuli (e.g., Lowin and Craig, 1968; Epstein, 1956). It is also possible that the leader evaluates and chooses behaviors in terms of the outcomes to which they lead.

Such a rational, hedonistic stance has permeated motivation research done on students (e.g., Atkinson and Feather, 1967) and on lower level employees (e.g., Vroom, 1964), but has been missing in managerial motivation literature. In fact, little has been done in managerial motivation, except for studies contrasting managers on self-actualization needs and/or pay satisfaction with non-supervisory workers (e.g., Centers, 1966; Dunnette, 1967; Porter and Lawler, 1968; Porter, 1962). However, a search for evidence on choice of leader behavior as a motivated activity reveals little research (Campbell et al., 1970).

To date, the problem of ineffective leadership has been defined as one of lack of ability, training, or skill. If we could just teach someone when to be considerate and when to be structuring, poor leadership would disappear. If we can merely perfect our selection devices -- and isolate the right abilities -- morale and effectiveness will skyrocket.

Failure in these attempts has been blamed on insufficient variables in the model, inferior pedagogies and measurement error. Little attention has been given to the validity of the underlying assumptions. Success as a leader-manager may be less a function of ability and/or information than of a decision about personal resource allocation. This viewpoint proposes that managers resolve the ambiguous and conflicting demands of their positions by estimating costs and rewards associated with various behaviors rather than assuming

congruence between the manager's and the organization's goals. This view treats leader behavior as any other behavioral pattern, that is, as a result of the person's motivation as well as of ability and situational factors.

What this indicates is that training may give the ability to obtain valued rewards by increasing skills. Yet, "failures" in training may not be failure to impart skills but offering of skills that are not valued by the individual as means of attaining desired ends. The assumption that everyone wants to be a good leader or an effective manager is subject to the caveat that "good" and "effective" have quite different meanings for the incumbent and for observers. What the observer sees as inappropriate behavior may simply be the pursuit of some goal other than group satisfaction or group performance or organizational effectiveness.

For example, leaders are rated more highly by their superiors for being independent and task-oriented (Barrett, 1966; Porter and Lawler, 1967) while the manager's subordinates respond more favorably to considerate, interpersonally-oriented behavior (Fleishman and Harris, 1966). To the extent that each of these audiences controls important rewards, the manager chooses between two activity profiles. In other words, the manager may not be performing ineffectively as judged by his/her supervisor because the demands of the superior are not understood but because he/she chooses to seek a good relationship with the work group. For managerial populations "level of performance" questions might be better phrased as "direction of performance."

This suggests both the informal and formal definitions of leadership have something to contribute; subordinates, peers, superiors and various others all impact on what the formal leader does and how it is done. These people have the ability to influence the leader's effectiveness, and his or her attainment of personal goals. If such is the case, those interested in training, evaluating, promoting and being leaders need to know (1) requirements of the entire

leadership role, not just as those relating to the immediate subordinates, and (2) the impact of the leader's own goals on his or her behavior.

A Recent Model

Mintzberg (1973) attempted to integrate the various demands on the formal leader into one model. Five top executives, heads of extremely successful organizations, were closely observed for one week each; these data were augmented by various mail, contact, and calendar records. The sample consisted of: the chairman/president of a major consulting firm; the president of an R & D engineering firm; the general director of a large, urban hospital; the president of a major manufacturing firm; and the superintendent of an innovative school system.

Content analysis of both observed and recorded activities unearthed ten different roles apparent in the managerial position. These ten fall into three major categories; the first three in the list below are the interpersonal roles. The second three are the informational roles, and the remaining four constitute the decision-making roles.

Figurehead . . .	Symbolic head; obliged to perform a number of routine duties, e.g., legal or social duties, involving his cermonial status
Leader	Responsible for motivation of subordinates, for staffing, training, and related duties
Liaison	Maintains self-developed network of outside contacts who provide favors, information, etc.
Monitor	Seeks and receives a wide variety of information to understand the organization and its environment; serves as the nerve center for internal and external information
Disseminator . .	Transmits information from others to subordinates or from subordinates to other subordinates, includes transmission of facts, interpretations and integration of value or policy positions
Spokesman . . .	Transmits facts, interpretations, values from his group to outsiders

Entrepreneur . . Searches the organization and environment for opportunities and initiates "improvement projects"

Disturbance Handler . . . Responsible for corrective action when confronted by important, unexpected disturbance

Resource Allocator . . Allocates organizational resources of all kinds; making or approving significant decisions

Negotiator . . Represents the organization at major negotiations, e.g., with unions, customers, suppliers

(Mintzberg, 1973, pp. 92-93)

As others have before, he found that there is an amazing similarity among the managerial jobs; the similarity holds across organizational levels (e.g., Choran, 1969; Bex, 1971), organizational types (e.g., Costin, 1970; Stewart, 1967), and even across national boundaries (e.g., Stewart, 1967; Inkson et al., 1970). There are some differences to be sure, nonetheless, the shared characteristics outnumber these differences and the differences are generally matters of emphasis rather than totally new behavior patterns.

This model focuses on three critical dimensions of the formal leadership position. First, the incumbent must interact with other people, process information, and make decisions. Second, the leader's interactions occur with superiors, subordinates and others not in that vertical relationship. Third, these interactions, decisions and information processing tend to be varied and fragmented. Besides being hit with a host of issues in quick sequence, the manager finds the important and the trivial back-to-back. In a ten-minute span, a principal may hear about a fight in the lavatory and a $40,000 budget cut.

Methodology

Questionnaires were mailed to public high school principals and to their superintendents; both instruments focused on the ten managerial roles derived

by Mintzberg. For each of the ten roles, a set of sample activities was given to clarify the definition of the role. Principals were asked: (a) how important is each role to effectiveness as a principal; (b) how much do you enjoy the activities involved in each role, and (c) how would you rate your performance in each role. Superintendents were requested to rate: (a) the importance of each role for effectiveness as a high school principal, and (b) the performance of the high school principal on that role.

Principals also evaluated the attractiveness of a number of work-related rewards, and whether effectiveness as a principal was seen as increasing or decreasing the probability of attaining each reward. The attractiveness ratings were factor analyzed (principal components with rotation) to produce four factors. "Recognition" refers to desire for self and collegial respect for my work. "Advancement" involves a desire for promotions either within or outside the school system. "Pace of work" reflects a desire for a slower pace of work or fewer responsibilities. "Present position" demonstrates a sensitivity to organizationally controlled rewards such as job security and salary increases.

The respondents were randomly selected from among New York State high school principals, excluding New York City. Questionnaires were sent to over 300 principals and their superintendents. After one follow-up mailing, 182 (or 41%) of the principals returned the questionnaires; 132, (or 43%) of the superintendents participated. Of these totals, there were 72 principal-superintendent pairs.

State records provided a geographic index of each school, the size of each school by number of teachers and number of students, and the rate of teacher turnover for that year. Teacher turnover and superintendent rating of principal performance were used as the dependent variables.

RESULTS

The first research question was: to what extent do the leader's own reward preferences affect perceptions of the leadership role demands. Pearson product-moment coefficients were computed between each of the ten leadership roles and the motivational variables (see Table 1). The motivational variables include the four career outcome factors and the enjoyment of that role's activities. The demographic variables include the principal's tenure in the system and as a principal. Situational variables are the number of teachers in the school and curricular composition of the student body.

As seen in Table 1, the enjoyment of the role activities was consistently and significantly related to the importance ratings for the roles. Only for the role of faculty leader was there a non-significant relationship; this may be due to lack of dispersion for that role. Faculty leader had the highest mean of the ten roles on both the importance and enjoyment ratings (see Table 2) and the lowest standard deviation. For the other nine roles, the more the principal enjoys the activities of that role, the more important the role is seen to be.

The next set of significant coefficients occurred between school composition and the ten importance ratings. The more "college-bound" the students are, the more important are the roles of monitor and spokesman for the principal. This means that a principal in a school where the students are primarily college-oriented sees the following sort of tasks as important: keeping up with current educational theory and practice; actively seeking news about innovations in other schools; attitudes of community and school board members; preparing publicity releases, budgets, reports; responding to questions about school programs and policies.

TABLE 1. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ROLE IMPORTANCE RATINGS AND MOTIVATION, DEMOGRAPHIC AND SCHOOL VARIABLES.

	MOTIVATION (N=179)					DEMOGRAPHIC (N=179)		SCHOOL (N=164)	
	Career Outcomes								
Principal's Rating of Role Importance:	Recognition	Advancement	Slower Pace	Present Position	Enjoyment of Role's Activities	#Years in School System	#Years as Principal	#Teachers in School	College-Orientation[1]
Figurehead	.24**	.07	.08	.01	.52**	.17	-.04	.11	-.23*
Leader	.15	-.08	.05	-.13	.12	.11	-.05	.14	.15
Liason	.21*	.13	.09	.07	.44**	.03	.12	.14	.02
Monitor	.15	-.03	-.03	-.07	.56**	.05	.06	.08	.29*
Disseminator	.07	.01	-.14	-.16	.50**	.04	.14	.11	.05
Spokesman	.15	-.06	.04	.04	.57**	.03	.05	.10	.30*
Disturbance Handler	.09	.05	.05	.01	.49**	.15	.07	-.04	-.24*
Resource Allocator	.26**	-.06	.01	.00	.35**	.11	.04	.11	.03
Initiator	.11	-.06	.03	.03	.20*	-.04	.08	.05	.06
Negotiator	-.01	.12	.08	.03	.32**	.06	.05	.19	-.24*

*p < .01
**p < .001

[1]The higher the score, the more graduates go on to 4 year colleges. The continuum goes through junior colleges, vocational schools, jobs/military service.

On the other hand, the less "college-bound" are the students, the more highly the principal rates figurehead, resource allocator, and negotiator. These roles involve such activities as: speaking at graduation, etc.; appearing at sport and other functions; scheduling staff assignments, getting substitutes, equipment, etc.; participating in union negotiations, contract implementation.

The third variable to produce significant relations was Recognition. As desire for professional esteem or approval by colleagues and others increased, the perceived importance of figure-head, liason and initiator increased. These are the three most visible roles, involving such activities as presiding at ceremonial functions, introducing innovations, and maintaining external contacts.

None of the other three career goals, tenure in the system, tenure as principal, or number of teachers in the school were related to perceived role importance.

The relationship between the principal's and superintendent's definition of the principal's job was considered sufficiently important to warrant independent investigation. Table 2 compares mean importance ratings between the two groups, and shows the correlation of the ratings by superintendent-principal pairs.

Comparisons of ranking by mean of the importance ratings demonstrated that there was no significant difference between principals and superintendents in rank order. T-tests revealed 5 significant differences between the means; for 4 of these, superintendents rated the roles as less important than did the principals.

TABLE 2. COMPARISONS OF SUPERINTENDENT-PRINCIPAL DEFINITION OF THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE

	Principal Rating of Importance (N=179)		Superintendent Rating of Importance (N-127)		Level of significance of T-Value	r (Superintendent Principal Importance Rating, N=74)
	Mean	S. D.	Mean	S. D.		
Figurehead	5.81	1.20	5.61	1.26	.01	.21
Leader	6.64	.70	6.69	.57	NS	.18
Liason	5.29	1.14	5.51	1.09	.01	.02
Monitor	5.60	1.12	5.52	1.14	NS	-.23*
Disseminator	5.63	1.13	5.57	1.10	NS	-.13
Spokesman	5.74	1.27	5.40	1.26	.01	.03
Disturbance Handler	6.32	.88	6.17	1.10	.01	-.02
Resource Allocator	5.17	1.38	4.95	1.51	.01	.23*
Initiator	6.26	.90	6.20	.97	NS	-.04
Negotiator	3.66	1.75	3.60	1.70	NS	-.07

*p < .05

Correlation coefficients for paired superintendent-principal importance ratings showed even less homogeniety. Eight of the ten coefficients were nonsignificant; one was low, significant and positive. The more important the principal thought the more important the superintendent considered that role. The resource allocator role is the traditional administrative function, including such duties as budgeting, scheduling, etc.

The other statistically significant relationship was also low, but negative. The more important the monitor role appeared to the principal, the less importance was attributed to it by the superintendent. While it is interesting to speculate about these two coefficient, the more critical conclusion is that there is extremely little agreement between a principal and his/her superintendent on the principal's job.

Table 3. Comparison of Percent of Explained Variance in Importance Ratings Accounted for by Situational Variables and by Personal Variables.

Importance of	Situational Factors (N=67)[1]	Personal Factors[2] (N=125)
Figurehead	.283	.269
Leader	(.159)	(.027)
Liason	.283	.219
Monitor	.423	.292
Disseminator	(.176)	.245
Spokesman	.361	.335
Disturbance Handler	(.124)	(.054)
Resource Allocator	.275	.277
Initiator	(.134)	(.166)
Negotiator	.432	(.099)

[1]includes: number of teachers; superintendent's rating of role importance; school composition as defined by distribution of students across curricular programs.

[2]includes: liking of the role activity by the principal; most preferred career goal, and expectancy of attaining that goal by being an effective principal.

Table 3 shows the result of regression analyses done for situational and motivational variables. For 5 of the roles, both sets accounted for at least 20% of the variance explained; for 2 other roles, one set of independent variables accounted for at least 20% of the variance explained. Both sets of variables are useful in explaining the principal's job definition.

The second research question dealt with the consequences of this job definition for the principal. Two dependent variables were used; the first was a rating of the principal's over-all performance by the superintendent. The second was the rate of teacher turnover in the school; this was used as a measure of teacher satisfaction with the principal, albeit a confounded one. Product-moment correlations between each of the ten importance ratings and these two variables produced no significant relationships. For superintendent rating, the highest coefficient was .14; the median was .05. For teacher turnover, the highest was .19 while the median was .03. Principal's job definition had no impact on these two performance measures.

Difference scores were calculated. Superintendent's rating of role importance was subtracted from the principal's rating of role importance; sign of the difference was ignored. A comparison of the relationships of difference scores and principal importance rating with the two dependent variables is given in Table 4.

The use of the difference scores had surprisingly little impact on the superintendent's rating of principal performance. The difference scores generally showed no higher correlations with superintendent rating than did principal importance ratings alone.

Table 4. Correlations of Role Importance Ratings and Difference Scores with Superintendent Rating of Principal Performance and Rate of Teacher Turnover (N=70)

	Superintendent Rating of Performance		Rate of Teacher Turnover	
	Principal's Importance	Difference Score	Principal's Importance	Difference Score
Figurehead	-.02	.23*	-.02	-.18
Leader	.00	-.05	.09	-.12
Liason	.07	.15	-.01	-.25*
Monitor	-.01	.10	-.07	.03
Disseminator	-.09	-.10	.03	.10
Spokesman	.05	-.16	.13	-.34**
Disturbance Handler	.05	.02	.05	.09
Resource Allocator	-.06	-.12	-.02	.32**
Initiator	.14	.01	.19	.06
Negotiator	.06	-.05	.09	.05

*p < .05
**p < .01

Regarding teacher turnover, however, the use of difference scores did produce major changes in three of the roles. For the liason and spokesman roles, increased differences between the superintendent and principal importance perceptions was associated with decreased turnover. For the resource allocator role, increased difference scores were associated with increased turnover. It was concluded that principal job definition per se was not a critical factor in teacher feelings. Conflict in the administrative hierarchy over the principal's job, at least conflict in certain role areas, is an important factor in understanding teacher turnover.

A secondary analysis showed that superintendent's performance rating was related to tenure as principal (-.19) and tenure in the system (-.31); these were significant at the .05 and .01 level respectively. The longer a principal has been in that position and/or in that system, the lower

the superintendent rates the principal's performance. Neither school composition or size was related to superintendent's rating. None of the demographic of situational variables were associated with teacher turnover.

Discussion

The mean importance ratings of the ten Mintzberg roles, as well as the comments from respondents, indicate that these roles are useful descriptors of the principal's job. As such, they provide a starting point for developing better research models and instruments. Like other formal leaders, the principal is caught up in a hectic, varied environment that contains pressures from superiors, subordinates, peers and many others. One explanation for the disappointing results of thousands of leadership studies is that the basic model was too restricted. These roles offer a wider framework in which to study the leader-manager concept; they include the diverse demands and duties that confront the formal leader.

This role set also indicates new avenues of training (Conklyn, 1974). The instrument used in this research has been incorporated into one training program with promising results. Anecdotal evidence from the participants report that the role set has been useful in increasing understanding of- and ability to deal with- the pace and pressures of the principalship.

The study, however, demonstrates that the principal's own motivation is an important factor in determining his/her job definition. As we build contingency models of leadership that include group, task and organization variables, we must deal with the incumbent's career goals and reward structures. These internal factors have a powerful influence on role perceptions.

For the high school principal, one school-level variable also exerted a large influence on job definition. The composition of the student body, i.e., college-bound vs. job-bound, was a critical factor; perceived role importance varied with student curricular composition.

On the other hand, a superintendent's view of the principal's job had no relationship to the incumbent's perception. This would seem to have very negative consequences for administrative relationships, unless these discrepancies were brought into the open and legitimized. Given different expectations about what the principal should be doing, the superintendent may disagree with requests for resources, not support the principal on issues which the latter thinks are crucial, and be critical of the principal's allocation of time and effort. This situation is not conducive to maximum performance for the whole system or for either individual.

On the research side, this state of affairs cautions against the blind acceptance of superintendent ratings as the sole performance measure. The criteria on which superintendents and principals judge the latter's performance do not appear to be the same. It is not safe to assume that the principal and superintendent are working from one job definition; this can result in different assessments of performance regardless of ability and/or effort expended.

In this study, neither principal's own job definition nor superintendent-principal difference in job definition was related to superintendent's rating of performance. The only relationship found with that rating was the principal's tenure in the system and as principal. In both cases, the longer the tenure, the lower the performance rating. Since there were no differences between long and short-tenured principals on any variables, it can be concluded that superintendents see a diminished effectiveness as one is in the system longer, irrespective of different

job perceptions, etc. This is a rather discouraging result and serves as a further warning against the unbridled use of supervisory ratings. It also poses an interesting question for future research, since the present study cannot address the question of why this should occur.

Using teacher turnover as a rough indicator of teachers' reaction to the principal's performance, we find that principal job definition per se is not related to turnover. Superintendent-principal difference in role perceptions for the principalship, however, were associated with differing rates of turnover. Future research should reveal why this happens; understanding the dynamics of this relationship may shed light on the conflicting findings about the effectiveness of various leader styles.

In summary: the Mintzberg roles are promising descriptors of the principal's position; motivational variables and certain situational variables emerge as influencing the principal's role perceptions; superintendent's perceptions of the principal's role had little impact on the principal's perception; the difference between these two was related to teacher turnover; superintendent rating of principal performance was unrelated to any role perception variables, but was related to principal's tenure in the system and tenure as a principal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J. Stacey. The structure and dynamics of behavior in organizational boundary roles. In M. Dunnette. Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Atkinson, J. and Feather. A Theory of Achievement Motivation. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Barrett, Richard S. The influence of the supervisor's requirements on ratings. Personnel Psychology, 1966, 19, 375-387.

Bass, B. M. Some effects on a group of whether and when the head reveals his opinion. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. 1967, 2, 375-382.

Bex. Some observations regarding the managerial role in a changing environment. Presented at U. K. Operational Research Society Conference, September, 1971.

Blake, R. R. and Mouton, J. S. The Managerial Grid. Houston: Gulf, 1964.

Bowers, D. G. and Seashore, S. E. Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-factor theory of leadership. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1962, 11, 238-263.

Burns, T. The directions of activity and communication in a departmental executive group. Human Relations, 1954, 7, 73-97.

Campbell, J. P., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E. and Weick, K. E. Managerial Behavior, Performance and Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Carlson, S. Executive Behavior. Stockholm: Strombergo, 1951.

Centers, R. and Bugental, D. E. Intrinsic and extrinsic job motivations among different segments of the working population. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, 50, 193-197.

Choran, I. The Manager of a Small Company. Montreal: McGill University. Unpublished M.B.A. thesis, 1969.

Christner, C. A. and Hemphill, J. K. Leader behavior of B-29 commanders and changes in crew members' attitudes toward the crew. Sociometry, 1955, 18, 82-87.

Cohen, M. D. and Olsen, J. P. A garbage can model of organization choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1972, 17, 1-25.

Conklyn, E. D. "Leader vs. manager: an updated look at an old dilemma" paper presented to North Carolina Association for Research in Education. May, 1975.

Costin, A. A. Management Profiles in Business and Government. Montreal: McGill University. Unpublished master's thesis, 1970.

Dunnette, M. D. The motives of industrial managers. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1967, 2, 176-182.

Epstein, S. An experimental study of some of the effects of variations in the clarity and the extent of a supervisor's area of freedom upon his supervisory behavior. Dissertation Abstracts, 1956, 16, 2513.

Evans, M. The effects of supervisory behavior on the path-goal relationship. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1970, 5, 277-298.

Fiedler, F. E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Fleishman, E. A. A leader behavior description for industry. In R. M. Stogdill and A. E. Coons. Leader Behavior - Its Description and Measurement. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business and Research Monograph #88, 1957.

Fleishman, E. A. and Harris, E. F. Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. Personnel Psychology, 1962, 15, 43-56.

Gibb, C. A. Leadership. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson Handbook of Social Psychology. (Vol. IV, 2nd ed). Reading, Mass.: 5, Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Goodstadt, B. and Kipnis, D. Situational influences on the use of power. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 201-207.

Graen, G., Orris, J. B., and Alvares, K. M. Contingency model of leadership effectiveness: some experimental results. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 196-201.

Guest, R. H. Of time and the foreman. Personnel, 1956, 32, 478-486.

House, Robert J. A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness, Administrative Science Quarterly, 1971, 16, 321-338.

House, Robert J. An experiment in the use of management training standards. Academy of Management Journal, 1962, 5, 76-81.

Hemphill, J. K. Relations between the size of the group and the behavior of "superior" leaders. Journal of Social Psychology, 1950, 32, 11-22.

Halpin, A. W., and Winer, B. J. A factorial study of the leader behavior descriptions. In R. Stogdill and A. Coons. Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1957.

Halpin, A. W. The leadership behavior and combat performance of airplane commanders. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 19-22.

Inkson, J. H. K., Schwitter, J. P., Pheysey, D. C. and Hickson, D. J. A comparison of organization structure and managerial roles: Ohio, USA, and the Midlands, England. The Journal of Management Studies, 1970, 7, 347-363.

Jasinski, F. J. Foremen relationships outside the work group. Personnel, 1956, 33, 130-136.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., and Rosenthal, R. A. Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R. L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Korman, A. K. Consideration, initiating structure and organizational criteria. Personnel Psychology, 1966, 18, 349-360.

Lawler, E. E., Porter, L., and Tannebaum, A. Manager's attitudes towards interaction episodes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52, 432-439.

Lowin, A. and Craig, J. R. The influence of level of performance on managerial style: an experimental object-lesson in the ambiguity of correlational data. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1968, 3, 440-458.

Maurer, J. G. Readings in Organizational Theory: Open-System Approaches. New York: Random House, 1971.

McCall, Morgan. W., Jr., The perceived informational environment of formal leaders. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1974.

McMahon, J. T. The contingency theory: logic and method revisited. Personnel Psychology, 1972, 25, 697-710.

Megargee, E. I., Bogart, P. and Anderson, B. J. Prediction of leadership in a simulated industrial task. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, 50, 292-295.

Mintzberg, Henry. The Nature of Managerial Work. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Pander, Q. D. The effective manufacturing foremen. In Young. Industrial Relations Research Association Proceeding of the Tenth Annual Meeting, Madison, Wisconsin, 41-54.

Porter, L. W. Job attitudes in management. I. Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of job level. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1962, 46, 375-384.

Porter, L. and Lawler, E. E., III. Managerial Attitudes and Performance. Homewood, Ill.: Irwin-Dorsey. 1968.

Sayles, L. R. Managerial Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Snoek, J. D. Role strain in diversified role sets. American Journal of Sociology, 1966, 71, 363-372.

Stewart, R. Managers and Their Jobs. London: Macmillan, 1967.

Stogdill, R. Handbook of Leadership. New York: The Free Press, 1974.

Stogdill, R. M. Managers, Employees and Organizations. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1965.

Stogdill, R. and Coons, A. E. Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1957.

Thomason, G. F. Managerial work roles and relationship, part I. The Journal of Management Studies, 1966, 3, 270-284.

Thomason, G. F. Managerial work roles and relationship, part II. The Journal of Management Studies, 1967, 4, 17-30.

Ulrich, D. N., Booz, D. R. and Lawrence, P. R. Management Behavior and Foremen Attitude Boston: Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration, 1950.

Vroom, Victor. Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Weick, K. E. The Social Psychology of Organizing. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Wernimont, D. F. What supervisors and subordinates expect of each other. Personnel Journal, 1971, 50, 204-208.